UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,397	08/04/2006	Yasuhiro Yamasaki	Q95210	3865
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 01/27/201 ON, PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSY	LVANIA AVENUE, N	RECEK, JASON D		
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2442	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/27/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/581,397	YAMASAKI, YASUHIRO	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JASON RECEK	2442	

	JASON RECEK	2442					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
HE REPLY FILED 30 December 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ad no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of appeal. Since a				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second co	nsideration and/or search (see NOT N); er form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying th					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the				
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-9,11-19 and 21-29. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Jason Recek/ Examiner, Art Unit 2442	/KEVIN BATES/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2456					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Applicant asserts that Aweya and Sisto do not disclose calculating a receivable amount so that the receivable amount comprises smaller than empty data amount being calculated from the data amount or informing the data transmission terminal of the receivable amount as recited by claim 1. As discussed in the rejection dated 7/30/10, Sisto discloses calculating available space (receivable amount) from the available buffer and ensuring a smaller amount (paragraph 23). Aweya teaches informing the sender (transmission terminal) of a receivable amount (col. 10 ln. 10-18, 30-44). Thus, the combination teaches the limitations in question. Applicant also asserts Aweya and Sillasto do not teach determining a transmissive amount based on the judgment as recited by claim 2. This is also not persuasive. Aweya teaches determining an amount based on queue parameters (col. 5 ln. 5-55) as discussed on pg. 7 of the rejection dated 7/30/10.